



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,696	09/12/2003	David D. Brandt	03AB014C/ALBRP303USC	7375

7590 03/23/2010
Susan M. Donahue
Rockwell Automation, 704-P, IP Department
1201 South 2nd Street
Milwaukee, WI 53204

EXAMINER

BAUM, RONALD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2439

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/23/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The amending of claims 1,7,12,15-17,25,26,30-34,36,38-41,49 and 50, and previous/associated interview/discussions with the applicant's representative - Brian Steed - to address the issues involved with the claim elements rejected in the last office action (12/21/2009), has failed to ascertain patently distinct material to amend the claims (via examiner amendment). The applicant's invention, as claimed, still essentially comprises a security management system with associated acquisition, storage, analysis/scanning and results reconfiguration/assets management, as applied to at least , a factory/automation environment, utilizing at least standard processing network devices (e.g. PLC's, PC's , etc.,). Discussed proposed potential amendments dealing with specific elements (i.e., the invention environment, protocols, network hardware elements, conformance issues, etc.,) failed to patently distinguish the claims - insofar as overcoming a potential USC 103' obviousness rejection - at least, dealing with the obviousness of the proposed specific elements as an (obvious) intended use (e.g., PLC with I/O modules - a factory automation environment - as obvious intended use of PC's with standard peripherals on a network). Therefore, the examiner declines to reopen prosecution. Thus, any such claims submitted formally after final rejection would not be entered..